

### **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed amendments and remarks is requested. Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended. Claims 18, 26-29, and 33-37 have been cancelled. Claims 1-17, 20-25, and 30-32 remain in the application.

### **ARGUMENT**

Claims 1-7, 9-10, 13-15, 17-21, 23, 25-31, 34 and 35-37 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonough (US 6,714,982) in view of Voit (US 6,104,711), in view of Namba (US 5,996,448).

The claims have been amended to more particularly recite the present invention. Independent claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended to recite the limitations of periodically transmitting a second request from the connection entity to the trusted arbitrator to open a third secure connection between the trusted arbitrator and the target entity within the LAN; transmitting a first response from the trusted arbitrator to the connection entity in response to the second request, the first response informing the connection entity that a request for the first secure connection between the source entity and the target entity exists in the trusted arbitrator; and establishing the third secure connection between the trusted arbitrator and one of the LAN, the connection entity, or the target entity, using a second encryption scheme in response to the first response, to allow communication between the source entity and the target entity over the first secure connection, the first secure connection comprising the second and third secure connections.

Neither McDonough, Voit nor Namba, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest all currently claimed limitations of claims 1, 9, and 17. Specifically, there is: 1) no teaching or suggestion of the connection entity periodically checking with the trusted arbitrator as to whether a request to open a secure connection with the

target entity exists in the trusted arbitrator, 2) no teaching or suggestion of the third connection being established between the trusted arbitrator and one of the LAN, connection entity or target entity, and 3) no teaching or suggestion that the first secure connection comprises the second and third secure connections.

Furthermore, no teaching or suggestion of the particular arrangement of claim elements and steps as claimed is found in the combination of references. The claims must be taken as a whole, without using the claim as a blueprint to find the disparate elements in the prior art in hindsight. As currently claimed, a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be properly made for the present claims based on the cited references. It would not have been obvious to combine these references because the combination of the teachings would not result in the claimed invention.

Thus, claims 1, 9, and 17 are allowable as presented. Accordingly, all claims dependent from independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are also allowable (2-8, 10-16, 20-25, and 30-32).

Claims 3, 11, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonough in view of Voit and Namba, and further in view of Wood (US 6,691,232).

These claims are allowable based on their dependency from their respective allowable independent claims.

Claims 8, 16, and 32 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonough in view of Voit and Namba, and further in view of Jaamies (US 6,138,037).

These claims are allowable based on their dependency from their respective allowable independent claims.

Claims 12 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonough in view of Voit and Namba, and further in view of Kung (US 5,434,918).

Claim 12 is allowable because it depends from allowable independent claim 9.

Claims 35-37 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonough in view of Voit and Namba, and further in view of McCurley, US patent application publication 2003/0167403).

The Applicants note that the Office action dated September 19, 2005, did not properly cite to the McCurley reference. The rationale for the rejection relies McCurley (at least in the paragraph heading), but no discussion of McCurley is evident.

Nonetheless, in the interest of a compact prosecution, claims 35-37 are cancelled.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1-17, 20-25, and 30-32 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 264-8074. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steven P. Skabrat/  
Steven P. Skabrat  
Reg. No. 36,279  
Senior Attorney  
Intel Corporation  
(503) 264-8074

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor &  
Zafman, LLP  
12400 Wilshire Blvd.  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On: November 21, 2005

Signature:

  
Katherine Jennings